DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 250 908 FL 014 583

AUTHOR Gabbay, Anita; Mirensky, Debi
TITLE Cognitive Processes of Vocabulary Recognition.
PUB DATE [84]
NOTE 28p.
PUB TYPE Reports - Research/Technical (143)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Cognitive Processes; College Students; *Context Clues; Decoding (Reading); *English (Second Language); Foreign Countries; Hebrew; *Second Language Learning; *Vocabulary Development; *Word Recognition

ABSTRACT

This study investigates the cognitive processes used by nonnative students of English as a second language (ESL) in recognizing vocabulary items. Four specific questions are addressed: (1) To what extent does context aid in evoking educated guesses? (2) To what degree can contextual clues mislead intelligent guessing? (3) Do foreign language learners ignore wider contextual clues and focus only on the immediate radius of the unfamiliar vocabulary item? and (4) Do nonnative English learners perceive the meaning of unfamiliar items differently when items are presented in isolation rather than in a contextual framework? The subjects were 20 college-aged ESL students at the Hebrew University of Jerusalem with a normal range of ability. A three-part questionnaire was administered. One part was a 385-word text with 10 words representing various parts of speech replaced by nonsense words and numbered alternatives for the nonsense word. The second part contained 10 vocabulary items to translate in Hebrew. The third part contained the second part's vocabulary items within a context-overloaded text, for translation. Several results suggest that context can aid in evoking educated guesses, but some suggest that context can be misleading. Theories that the phrase or sentence is the meaningful unit, and that language learners cling to erroneous ideas despite obvious contextual clues were both confirmed, but the contention that contextual clues are always helpful was not confirmed. (MSE)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED250908

COGNITIVE PROCESSES OF VOCABULARY RECOGNITION

by Anita Gabbay and Debi Mirensky

I. Introduction and Review of the Literature

Much research has recently been carried out focusing on the methodologies of teaching a second language and how a target language is acquired from the language learners' point of view. However, there has been a relative dearth of material on the different aspects of vocabulary acquisition. It seems quite probable that this lack of research can be ascribed to the belief that vocabulary skills hold a secondary place in language teaching. Other skills such as aural and oral competence, grammar, reading comprehension etc. have been stressed to a much greater degree in the typical language classroom than have vocabulary skills.

Why do language teachers avoid concentrating on vocabulary skills in the classroom? Apparently several factors work together to cause such avoidance. Judd (1978) writes that vocabulary is generally regarded as a means to improve reading and listening comprehension, and is certainly not viewed as a skill in itself. Twadell (1978) believes that the downgrading of vocabulary teaching in the foreign language classroom is, perhaps, an attempt to avoid undue emphasis on direct translation which the students seem to demand. In our opinion, a large percentage of teachers feel uncomfortable teaching vocabulary skills because they believe that language learners can learn vocabulary items on their own by consulting a dictionary.

Clarke (1980) argues that vocabulary learning requires memorizing prefixes, roots and suffixes. At this point in language teaching development, rote memorization is an out-of-date skill and usually isn't favorably viewed by either teachers or learners. Another factor is that most roots, prefixes and suffixes have several meanings so that by incomplete memorization, or inadequate explanations, language learners may be misled and confused as to which meaning of the polyseme is intended. Examples of such cases are the words "inward", "invisible", "inform", "disappear", "disappoint", "until", "unofficial", etc.

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.
Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official NIE position or policy.

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Anita Gabbay

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

Vocabulary teaching involves the memorization of words and their various semantic connotations, a task viewed as meaningless, since only one definition of an unfamiliar item will probably be relevant to the context in which the item appears. Fries (1956) stresses the rather overwhelming number of different meanings to be found in the Oxford English Dictionary - 25,000 definitions for the first thousand words appearing on the Thorndike Word List!

Still another factor is pointed out by Steinberg (1978) who claims that teaching 'words' distorts the language learning process; in a language, the meaningful unit is the phrase or sentence, but the word in isolation is virtually irrelevant. Twadell (1978) also believes that vocabulary items should be taught within the context in which they appear since contextual clues, grammatical clues and pragmatic knowledge all interact to aid in comprehension of the unfamiliar vocabulary items and the parameters of their meanings.

We, too, believe that contextual clues may facilitate vocabulary recognition in reading. Certain types of clues may enable language learners to correctly guess the meaning of unknown words. Hosenfeld et. al. (1981) list several such clues:

1. Details of description which lead to an educated guess because the word is a summary of a description or explanation.
2. 'Signalled paraphrasing' which occurs when the word is restated and is clearly signalled to the reader through such terms as: "for example", "in other words", "that is to say", etc.
3. The meaning is implied by the readers' requisite knowledge, such as "a person who is tired is apt to yawn".
4. Contrast between a known phrase and an unknown expression whereby the contrast is signalled through the use of connectors or conjunctions embedded in the sentence structure.
5. True cognates, illustrations and examples.

Furthermore, we concur with Laufer and Bensoussan (1981) who feel that "explicit vocabulary teaching will result in a better command of vocabulary and this, in turn, will provide a larger context ..."

However, we believe that context is not the sole factor operating in the process of vocabulary recognition. As Laufer and Bensoussan (1981) have pointed out, second language learners may have wrong 'preconceived' notions about vocabulary items in the target language and may therefore 'behold' the meanings of these unfamiliar items incorrectly despite contextual clues designed to facilitate recognition of these items. Moreover, there may be an overload of new vocabulary items which can actually be counterproductive because language learners cannot cope with the quantity of unknown items. Alternatively, the context may be devoid of all contextual clues, thus minimizing the possibility of guessing the unfamiliar item via clues surrounding it simply because the clues are not there. Questions have been raised by Johns (1980) concerning the optimum density of unfamiliar items in relation to familiar items. Does such an ideal relation exist? Is it the same for all language learners?

The goal of this research project is to investigate factors involved in the cognitive processes of vocabulary recognition*. As teachers of EFL (English as a Foreign Language) we were intrigued by the question of how non-native English learners pinpoint the meaning of unfamiliar vocabulary items in relation to the context in which they appear. By encouraging our subjects to verbalize the reasons for their choices, we hope to reveal the thought processes which led the language learners to select their answers - whether correct or incorrect. Such an examination of cognitive strategies is important for evaluation of our goals in the EFL program of the Hebrew University of Jerusalem. The stated aim of our program is reading comprehension, an objective which clearly involves vocabulary recognition. Nevertheless, we minimize the explicit teaching of vocabulary, emphasizing instead the recognition of new words within context. Is this an effective method? Are students, in fact, able to correctly infer the meaning of unfamiliar words from the wider context? This research project focuses upon the following questions:

---

* The authors gratefully acknowledge the advice and guidance received from Professor Andrew Cohen of the Hebrew University of Jerusalem.

1. To what extent does context aid in evoking educated guesses?

2. To what degree can contextual clues mislead intelligent guessing?

3. Do foreign language learners actually ignore wider contextual clues and focus only on the immediate radius around the unfamiliar vocabulary item?

4. Do non-native English learners perceive the meaning of unfamiliar items differently when they are presented in isolation rather than in a contextual framework?

II. Methodology

A. Subjects

For our research project we selected a class of twenty first-year social-work students who were approximately twenty-two years old. These students were studying English as a Foreign Language in a required course at the Hebrew University of Jerusalem. The subjects have received training in acquiring reading comprehension skills six hours weekly over a period of seven months. 25% of the group are 'good' students, having attained an average of 75% or above on Trimester II uniform reading comprehension examinations. 50% of the group are ' average', with Trimester II grades ranging from 65% to 74%. Another 25% of the group are considered weak students who received less than 65% on their examinations.

B. Instruments

We administered a three-part questionnaire to these students. Part A consisted of a 385-word text taken from the Barron's Verbal Aptitude Workbook for College Entrance Examinations (1975). Ten words representing various parts of speech were omitted from the original text and were replaced by underlined nonsense words numbered consecutively. Underneath the printed text we provided four alternatives for each numbered nonsense item. The subjects were instructed to choose the alternative which best fit the context. Since the text in question was somewhat below their level for the majority of subjects, we assumed they would benefit from the contextual clues encountered and would be able to distinguish the correct (i.e. original) alternative from among the four "i" level choices.

We selected distractors that were based on various connotations of a Hebrew translation (see no.4 and no.5) or would 'play' on the context (see no.1,3, and 10). In some cases we manipulated different parts of speech (refer to no.2 and 4), connectors (see no.8), or antonyms (see no.7). In order to preserve the sense of continuity characteristic of a cohesive text, we chose not to use a traditional cloze format consisting of blank spaces. Instead we formulated nonsense words; we were curious to see whether our subjects would recognize them as such.

Part B consisted of ten open-ended vocabulary items presented in isolation. The subjects were instructed to provide a Hebrew translation of these mostly unfamiliar words (wherever possible) and to specify how they arrived at this translation. We were interested in seeing how our subjects perceived the roots, suffixes and prefixes of these ten items and what associations were evoked by the letter combinations comprising each word. Furthermore, we were curious to ascertain whether students who believed that they 'knew' a word from prior exposure did, in fact, correctly translate the word.

In Part C we presented the identical words given in Part B. However, this time the ten items were embedded in sentences or fragments of paragraphs. Unlike Part A where the original text remained intact, we manipulated all contextual clues in Part C. Thus, we constructed three sentences containing an overload of unfamiliar contextual clues (refer to nos.2,7, and 9), two sentences lacking contextual clues altogether (see nos.5 and 6), and five sentences containing simplified paraphrases (see nos.1 and 4), synonyms (refer to no.8), antonyms (see no.10) or exemplifications (refer to no.3) of the words in question. Our subjects were directed to provide a Hebrew translation for each item; then they were requested, once again, to indicate the process by which they arrived at each translation.

In order to facilitate their assessment of this cognitive process, we supplied the following graduated alternatives: (a) I already knew the word. (b) I guessed the meaning of the word from context. Copy those context words which provided the clues. (c) I guessed the meaning of the word even though the context didn't help me. (d) I didn't supply a translation for the word because I didn't understand the context. Our subjects were instructed to circle the most appropriate choice for each item.

In brief, then, our objectives were somewhat different for each section of the questionnaire. Part A presented a full cohesive text with ten nonsense words to be replaced by one of four given alternatives. Clues could be deduced from the text and could be narrowed down from among the multiple choices.

Part B consisted of ten unfamiliar vocabulary items presented in isolation. The aim of this section was to pinpoint different components operating in cognitive processes of vocabulary recognition. Our subjects were expected to supply a Hebrew translation of each item in an open-ended format. Part B also served as a check to inform the researchers if any of the subjects had been previously familiar with one or any of the ten presumably unfamiliar items.

Through the manipulation of all contextual clues, Part C would hopefully reveal the relationship between the amount of contextual information given and the correct perception of an item. Unlike Part A, the focal point of Part C was to be the conscious assessment of various cognitive approaches.

C. Data Collection

Our questionnaire was administered over a period of 80 minutes. Parts A and B were distributed together and students were directed to complete them within 40 minutes. As these completed sections were turned in, each subject received Part C which was to be answered within 40 minutes. Since the written directions for all these sections appeared self-explanatory, there was no need for any additional oral instructions. To aid the subjects in understanding the instructions, Part A and Part C contained samples of what was required of the subjects. While the subjects worked on Part C, the researchers circulated, eliciting clarification and/or amplification of written responses to Part B. In addition, comments regarding the subjects' reactions to the questionnaire were also solicited.

III. Data Analysis

In order to analyze our data, we charted the frequency distribution and item difficulty of each item in Parts A, B and C. (see Tables I, II and III). In Part C we not only examined correct, incorrect or omitted responses, but also took separate counts for the multiple choice answers and for the clues elicited in choice 'b'.

For Part A, the mean score was 39.5% and the standard deviation was 13.6. The split-half reliability factor was 0.22. Although these results did not correlate highly with the subjects' reading comprehension examination scores ($r=-.08$), they suggest an interesting interpretation.

For Part C, we obtained a mean score of 46% and a standard deviation of 15.3. A statistically significant positive correlation was found between the results of Part C and the subjects' grades on the Trimester II uniform reading comprehension examinations ($r=.59$, $p>.01$).

IV. Findings and Discussion

A. Several of our results strongly suggest that context can aid in evoking educated guesses. In Part A, 95% of our subjects answered question 4 correctly. For this question we had chosen distractors that were variations of the Hebrew translation (y'sadi); however, when questioned after turning in Part A, the subjects claimed that they knew 'food is an elementary need', and therefore the contextual clues immediately surrounding the nonsense word 'franti' were successfully pinpointed. Sixty percent of the subjects answered question 2 correctly, subsequently explaining that they had selected the answer 'benefit' as a result of the two contextual clues 'at the same time' and a 'solution' - which, taken together, meant that the correct replacement for the nonsense word had to be a positively connotated noun.

Part C, which contained manipulated contextual clues for ten unfamiliar words, also presented evidence that context can aid in correctly understanding a previously unfamiliar vocabulary item. For example, 85% of the subjects correctly translated 'banished' in question 1, an item no one had been able to translate when encountered in isolation in Part B. Eighty five per cent of the subjects understood 'obstinate' from the minimal clue given in the manipulated sentence:'refused'. Again, the word had been entirely new to the subjects as no one could correctly translate it when it appeared in isolation in Part B.(no.3) Question 8 which contained the unfamiliar vocabulary item 'intrepid' was correctly guessed by 90% of the subjects. This sentence contained a manipulated synonym as well as an antonym, and the best results from all of Part C were found here. Although there were several subjects who had attempted to guess the meaning of 'intrepid' when it appeared in isolation in Part B ('rapid','interpret', or 'trapped' were the most frequent associations), no one had been familiar with the correct meaning. The results of question 10 also support the claim that context aids in comprehending an unknown item, as 85% of the subjects correctly understood the target word 'boisterous'. There exists a possibility that it was easier for the subjects to guess the unfamiliar item because it is an adjective which appeared with a known noun.

B. One of the questions asked within the framework of this research project was whether context can actually mislead in understanding unfamiliar vocabulary items. Several of our results present proof that such is the case. In Part A we selected two distractors which we supposed might be chosen if the subjects selected the wrong contextual clues to concentrate on. We found that 70% of the subjects answered question 1 incorrectly and that 20% selected the distractor 'toxic' as a result of the misleading contextual clue 'taxation'; thirty per cent selected the distractor 'aggressive' as a result of wrongly focusing on the contextual clue 'war'. Question 5 again points to misleading contextual clues. The researchers purposely chose distractors which would play on the word 'sight', and 80% of the subjects indeed guessed wrongly here. When questioned after completing Part A, many subjects claimed that they had associated the correct answer 'view' with 'scenery' or 'opinion', and that they were not familiar with the idiomatic expression 'in view of'. The results of question 7 were interesting because 85% of the subjects answered incorrectly as they saw the word 'richest' in the sentence and ignored the true contextual clue 'disastrously'. Thus they selected either of the two positively connotated distractors: 'affluent' or 'sufficient'. Sixty-five percent of the subjects selected the wrong replacement word for question 8. They misinterpreted the punctuation. In this case, punctuation clearly was a contextual clue and the subejcts seemed to have overlooked it.

Several of our results in Part C also suggest that context can be misleading. Question 2, which was specifically written to play on the wrong preconceived notion of 'veracity' with 'variety' (which is how the target word 'veracity' was translated in Part B), was incorrectly translated by 90% of the subjects when it appeared in context in Part C. A few of the subjects selected contextual clues that were off target, but could justify the translation of the unfamiliar item as 'variety'. Sixty percent of the subjects incorrectly understood the target item 'decorum' which appeared in question 5. Many of the subjects had understood the item (when it appeared in Part B) as 'decoration', so they selected the word'exhibit' from the manipulated sentence to support their notion that 'decorum' is synonymous with 'decoration'. There was a dearth of

clues in question 6 so that the researchers expected a high percentage of the subjects to be misled, and, predictably, 95% of the subjects wrongly translated the unfamiliar vocabulary item 'perfunctory'. In Part B a large percentage of the subjects had associated it with the word 'function' and this preconceived notion was carried over to Part C. Such a combination of choosing incorrect contextual clues along with wrong preconceived notions was also evident in question 7. Eighty-five percent of the subjects incorrectly translated 'parsimonious'. This result was expected since the sentence had been overloaded with unfamiliar vocabulary so that the subjects were confused and focused on misleading clues. Interestingly enough, four subjects had translated 'parsimonious' correctly in Part B which indicated that they were familiar with the word, but only two subjects correctly translated the target item when it appeared within a contextual framework in Part C. This suggests that those two subjects who incorrectly translated the word the second time around when it appeared in context, were misled by the contextual clues given in the sentence and that they altered their conceptions as to the meaning of the target vocabulary item.

C. The third question asked in this research project is whether contextual clues are sometimes ignored. In Part C the written results and oral explanations of the subjects revealed that in certain cases contextual clues had been ignored. Subjects who had had the wrong preconceived notion of 'agility' with 'ability', and translated 'agility' as such, found supporting clues to substantiate this notion. Question 9 had been manipulated so that there would be many contextual clues, but 65% of the subjects ignored the multitude of clues and, instead, found methods to combine several non-clues to support the assumption that 'agility' was indeed 'ability'. This phenomenon of ignoring contextual clues reappeared in question 10 of Part A where 70% of the subjects wrongly selected a replacement word for the nonsense word 'gramper'. The majority of these subjects explained that they had missed the contextual clues which appeared several lines before the nonsense word. The gap between the clear contextual clues and the target item caused the subjects to ignore the true clues, and, instead, to select a replacement word on the basis of supposed contextual clues which surrounded the nonsense word.

D. How did the subjects perceive unfamiliar items when they appeared in isolation in Part B or in context in Part C? For the most part, the subjects had guessed at the meaning of unfamiliar items in Part B. For example, 'banished' was associated with 'vanish'; 'veracity' was associated with 'variety'; 'decorum' was associated with 'decoration'; 'intrepid' was associated with 'trapped', 'interpret' or 'rapid'. In most cases the subjects changed their preconceived notions and associations when they viewed the target items within an 'i' level contextual framework. Although several subjects had wrong preconceived notions of 'intrepid' as revealed in Part B, 90% understood the meaning correctly when it appeared in Part C, and this suggests that many of the subjects were astute enough to change their preconceived notions when confronted by contextual clues that were understood.

A high percentage of the subjects, however, found ways to twist given contextual clues to fit their world view and managed to justify their mis-translation when the items reappeared in Part C. For example, 85% of the subjects stuck with their preconceived notion of 'decoration' as a synonym of 'decorum'; and in the case of 'parsimonious', two subjects even changed their correct preconceived notions for faulty ones by selecting misleading contextual clues. Apparently some subjects attempted to mold the context and twist contextual clues to fit in with their own conceptions of the unfamiliar vocabulary items, thus substantiating Laufer and Sim's claim (1983).

V. Conclusion

The results of Parts A and C in particular support Steinberg's theory (1978) that the true meaningful unit is a phrase or sentence. Our results also add strength to Laufer and Bensoussan's hypothesis (1982) that language learners tend to cling to inaccurate preconceived notions in spite of sometimes obvious contextual clues. Twadell (1978) claimed that vocabulary items should be taught within the context in which they appear, as contextual clues aid in comprehension of unfamiliar vocabulary items. Our results, however, show otherwise, in that contextual clues may not always aid language learners and therefore must be viewed in their proper perspective within the parameters of overall reading comprehension skills. Our findings have thus truly confirmed Laufer and Bensoussan's thesis (1983) in regard to this concept.

Over the course of their EFL program, our subjects have been amply exposed to different reading comprehension skills. They have demonstrated their degree of internalization of these skills as shown by the normal bell curve of the scores obtained on the Trimester II uniform reading comprehension examinations. In retrospect, we believe that it would have been useful to have administered an overall comprehension test of Part A for purposes of correlation with the above test scores and the actual results of Part A.

In light of the oral interviews administered after Part A, we found that most of the subjects did indeed understand the main ideas of the text. However, when asked to focus on several particular vocabulary items, they performed poorly. Upon questioning ourselves why such poor results were obtained, we realized that in some cases the choice of certain distractors in Part A may have been misleading. For example, in question 3 the distractor 'transmission' attracted 80% of the subjects because they understood the prefix 'trans', but not the entire word. In question 9 many subjects had difficulty in distinguishing between the distractors 'increasingly' and 'gradually' where the difference between them is merely a factor of time. All of the distractors which appeared in Part A had been presented within the class curriculum of the EFL program.

From our findings in Part A, we must sadly conclude that even if students have been exposed and re-exposed to words over a period of several months, they are seldom able to internalize this new vocabulary.

We suspect that the prior learning experiences of many of our weaker subjects were probably centered around explicit teaching of vocabulary items rather than on comprehensive skills for better general understanding of texts and passages. Quite possibly these subjects had been taught to focus on word lists, rote memorization, vocabulary drills etc. Apparently, explicit vocabulary teaching does not adequately answer the language learner's needs on an overall basis. Why then should we be so concerned about students' ability to recognize specific vocabulary items? Isn't it sufficient to teach them how to decide which unfamiliar words are important enough to look up in a dictionary?

In short, what key element should be stressed in a language learning program? Our conclusion is that reinforcement of strong, wide-ranging reading comprehension skills seems to be more effective than specific vocabulary teaching. Not only are these skills far more limited in number than the amount of new vocabulary encountered, but they are transferable to any text and provide language learners with methods when unfamiliar vocabulary items appear within a context.

N = 20

TABLE I

Item Analysis and Frequency Distribution of Part A

Question	%Correct	% Incorrect	% No Answer	Percentage of Distractors			
				A	B	C	D
1	30	70	-	20	✓	20	30
2	65	25	10	10	15	0	✓
3.	5	80	15	✓	80	0	0
4.	95	5	-	0	✓	5	0
5.	20	80	-	5	✓	50	25
6.	70	30	-	✓	5	10	15
7.	25	60	15	30	15	✓	15
8.	35	60	5	15	5	35	✓
9.	45	40	15	10	✓	30	0
10.	15	70	15	40	20	10	✓

* ✓ : indication of the correct answer

TABLE II N = 20

Item Analysis and Frequency Distribution of Part I

VOCABULARY ITEM	% CORRECT	% INCORRECT	%NO ANSWER
1.banished	0	6	14
2.veracity	0	11	9
3.obstinate	0	1	19
4.imperceptible	8	3	9
5.decorum	0	11	9
6.perfunctory	0	13	7
7.parsimonious	4	2	14
8.intrepid	0	13	7
9.agility	0	3	17
10.boisterous	0	2	18

TABLE II B

Item Difficulty of Part B

Number 4 = .4

Number 7 = .2

TABLE III N = 20

Item Analysis and Frequency Distribution of Part C

Question 1 (vocabulary item: banished)
85% correct

Cognitive Strategy
A -0%
B - 100% ; 95% correct clues
C -0%
D -0%

Question 2 (vocabulary item: veracity)
5% correct
60% incorrect
35% no answer

Cognitive Strategy
A - 10%
B -40%; 5% correct clues
C - 10%
D - 40%

Question 3 (vocabulary item: obstinate)
80% correct
15% incorrect
5% no answer

Cognitive Strategy
A -0%
B -95%; 90% correct clues
C - 0%
D - 5%

Question 4 (vocabulary item: imperceptible)
50% correct
45% incorrect
5% no answer

Cognitive Strategy
A -15%
B-65%; 45% correct clues
C - 10%
D - 10%

Question 5 (vocabulary item: decorum)
15% correct
60% incorrect
25% no answer

Cognitive Strategy
A -5%
B-65%; 15% correct clues
C -5%
D - 25%

Question 6 (vocabulary item: perfunctory)
5% correct
95% incorrect

Cognitive Strategy
A -10%
B -70% ; 0% correct clues
C - 5%
D -15%

Question 7 (vocabulary item: parsimonious)
10% correct
30% incorrect
60% no answer

Cognitive Strategy
A -15%
B -25% ;15% correct clues
C -0%
D-60%

TABLE III continued

Question 8 (vocabulary item: intrepid)
90% correct
5% incorrect
5% no answer

Cognitive Strategy
A -0%
B - 95%: 90% correct clues
C -0%
D -5%

Question 9 (vocabulary item: agility)
35% correct
35% incorrect
30% no answer

Cognitive Strategy
A -5%
B -60%: 30% correct clues
C -5%
D - 30%

Question 10 (vocabulary item: boisterous)
85% correct
5% incorrect
10% no answer

Cognitive Strategy
A -0%
B -90%: 80% correct clues
C - 0%
D - 10%

APPENDIX

Part A

INSTRUCTIONS:

From the 4 choices given below for each item, circle the word which best replaces the numbered word in the text.

The world at present is spending on preparations for war more than $112 billion a year, roughly $450 per head for chale(ie) man, woman and child in the world. Let us consider for a moment what could be done with this sum if it were spent on peace and not on war. Some of it, at any rate, in the more spocken(1) countries, could be spent on reduction of taxation. The rest should be spent in ways that will, at the same time, be of cateryl(2) to mankind and a solution to the economic problem of dacmo(3) from war-based industries to peace-based industries. As to this expansion, let us begin with the most franti(4) of all needs, food. At present, the majority of mankind suffers from undernourishment, and in prantle(5) of the population explosion, this situation is likely to grow worse in coming decades. A very small part of what is now being spent upon arms would malan(6) our dilemma. Not only could surpluses of food which are frequently destroyed today be distributed for use, but technology could be utilised to find ways to increase food production.

Housing, even in the richest of countries, is often disastrously balabel(7). This could be remedied by a small percent of what is now being spent on missiles.

(ie) a. all b. together ©. every d. one

(1) a. toxic b. prosperous c. aggressive d. permissive

(2) a. aspiration b. substantial c. generous d. benefit

(3) a. conversion b. transmission c. confrontation d. elimination

(4) a. complete b. elementary c. fundamentally d. establishing

(5) a. sight b. view c. perception d. regard

(6) a. resolve b. predict c. consider d. prolong

(7) a. sufficient b. challenging c. inadequate d. affluent

Education everywhere, but especially in Third World nations, demands an expenditure many times as great as that which it receives at present. Eppes(8) it is not only greater expenditure that is needed in education. If the threat of war were removed, science could be devoted to improving human welfare, instead of to the invention of zyliph(9) expensive methods of mutual slaughter; and schools would no longer need to think of it as part of their duty to promote hatred of possible enemies by means of ignorance tempered by lies.

The world could enter a period of happiness and prosperity far surpassing anything known in previous history. Such peace is possible if a different outlook on international relations is adopted along with a different attitude toward those nations which are presently regarded as enemies. This is possible, but it cannot be accomplished at once. To cramper(10) the trend of affairs in the most powerful nations of the world is no light task, and will require a difficult process of re-education.

---

(8) a. Since b. Whereas c. Moreover d. But

(9) a. likely b. increasingly c. gradually d. perpetually

(10) a. emphasize b. maintain c. adjust d. reverse

PART B

From your overall knowledge of English, try to supply a Hebrew translation of the words presented below. Explain how you arrived at this translation; for example, you might answer "I already knew the word" or "I guessed the meaning from the prefix, suffix or root etc." Your explanation may be given in Hebrew.

1. banished -
2. veracity -
3. obstinate -
4. imperceptible -
5. decorum -
6. perfunctory -
7. parsimonious -
8. intrepid -
9. agility -
10. boisterous -

Part C

This time, the words that you translated into Hebrew in Part B will appear, underlined, in context. Again, translate each underlined word into Hebrew; then, circle the letter next to the sentence that best describes the process by which you arrived at your translation.

Example: The inexperienced employee was nervous on his first day of work

inexperienced - לא מנוסה

I arrived at this answer because:

a. I already knew the word.

(b) I guessed the meaning of the word from context

Copy those context words which provided the clues

nervous, first day of work

c. I guessed the meaning of the word even though the context didn't help me

d. I didn't supply a translation for the word because I didn't understand the context.

1. The king had been so cruel that after the revolution he was banished. Some members of the Parliament opposed this decision, but the majority ruled that the king should leave the country forever.

banished - _____

I arrived at this answer because:

a. I already knew the word.

b. I guessed the meaning of the word from context

Copy those context words which provided the clues

_____

c. I guessed the meaning of the word even though the context didn't help me.

d. I didn't supply a translation for the word because I didn't understand the context.

2. The witness undermined the veracity of his testimony by his incredible reconstruction of the heist.

veracity - _____

I arrived at this answer because:

a. I already knew the word.

b. I guessed the meaning of the word from context.

Copy those context words which provided the clues.

_____

c. I guessed the meaning of the word even though the context didn't help me.

d. I didn't supply a translation for the word because I didn't understand the context.

3. The obstinate child refused to eat.

obstinate - _____

I arrived at this answer because:

a. I already knew the word.

b. I guessed the meaning of the word from context.

Copy those context words which provided the clues.

_____

c. I guessed the meaning of the word even though the context didn't help me.

d. I didn't supply a translation for the word because I didn't understand the context.

4. The prisoner seemed to relax, but he was, in fact, planning his escape. With a movement so gradual that it was imperceptible, he managed to push the keys towards him before the guard even realized a move had been made.

imperceptible - _____

I arrived at this answer because:

a. I already knew the word.

b. I guessed the meaning of the word from context.

Copy those context words which provided the clues.

_____

c. I guessed the meaning of the word even though the context didn't help me.

d. I didn't supply a translation for the word because I didn't understand the context.

5. At religious services people usually exhibit a certain degree of decorum.

decorum - _____

I arrived at this answer because:

a. I already knew the word.

b. I guessed the meaning of the word from context.

Copy those context words which provided the clues.

_____

c. I guessed the meaning of the word even though the context didn't help me.

d. I didn't supply a translation for the word because I didn't understand the context.

6. The doctor gave perfunctory examinations to the two old men.

perfunctory - _____

I arrived at this answer because:

a. I already knew the word.

b. I guessed the meaning of the word from context.

Copy those context words which provided the clues.

_____

c. I guessed the meaning of the word even though the context didn't help me.

d. I didn't supply a translation for the word because I didn't understand the context.

7. He was a miser, a parsimonious person who gleefully hoarded his massive fortune.

parsimonious - _____

I arrived at this answer because:

a. I already knew the word.

b. I guessed the meaning of the word from context.

Copy those context words which provided the clues.

_____

c. I guessed the meaning of the word even though the context didn't help me.

d. I didn't supply a translation for the word because I didn't understand the context.

8. Everyone else was too afraid to move. Jason, however, the only intrepid man aboard, demonstrated his bravery by jumping forward to snatch the gun from the thief.

intrepid - _____

I arrived at this answer because:

a. I already knew the word.

b. I guessed the meaning of the word from context.

Copy those context words which provided the clues.

_____

c. I guessed the meaning of the word even though the context didn't help me.

d. I didn't supply a translation for the word because I didn't understand the context.

9. The agility of the pianist was impressive, as his nimble fingers flew over the keyboard with amazing precision.

agility - _____

I arrived at this answer because:

a. I already knew the word.

b. I guessed the meaning of the word from context.

Copy those context words which provided the clues.

_____

c. I guessed the meaning of the word even though the context didn't help me.

d. I didn't supply a translation for the word because I didn't understand the context.

10. The quiet calm of the library was disturbed by the boisterous laughter of the workers outside.

boisterous - _____

I arrived at this answer because:

a. I already knew the word.

b. I guessed the meaning of the word from context.

Copy those context words which provided the clues.

_____

c. I guessed the meaning of the word even though the context didn't help me.

d. I didn't supply a translation for the word because I didn't understand the context.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Clarke, D. and Nation, I. "Guessing the Meanings of Words from Contextual Strategy and Techniques" in System Vol.8, 1980, pages 211-220.

Fries, C. Teaching and Learning English as A Foreign Language. 1956. University of Michigan, Ann Arbor, Michigan.

Hosenfeld, C. et. al. "Second Language Reading: A Curricular Sequence for Teaching Reading Strategies" in Foreign Language Annals Vol. 14, no. 5 Dec. 1981, pages 415-422.

Johns, T. "The Text and its Message: An Approach to the Teaching of Reading Strategies for Students of Development Administration", Mimeograph, University of Birmingham, 1980.

Judd, E. "Vocabulary Teaching and TESOL: A Need for Re-evaluation of Existing Assumptions", TESOL Quarterly, Vol.12, No.1 (March 1978), pages 71-76.

Laufer, B. and Bensoussan, M. "Meaning is in the Eye of the Beholder", English Teaching Forum, Vol.20, No.2 (April 1982) pages 10-13.

Laufer, B. and Bensoussan, M. "Lexical Guessing in Context in EFL Reading Comprehension" in Journal of Research in Reading (1983).

Laufer, B, and Sim, D.D. "Taking the Easy Way Out - Non-use and Misuse of Clues in EFL Reading". Haifa: Department of Foreign Languages, 1983.

Saragi, T. "Vocabulary Learning and Reading" in System vol. 6, 1978, no.2, pages 72-78.

Seibert, A. "A study of the Practice of Guessing Word Meanings From a Context" in Modern Language Journal, Vol.29, 1945, pages 296-323.

Steinberg, J. "Contextual Clues as Aids in Comprehension" in System, 1978, vol.8, pages 6-9.

Twadell, W.F. "Vocabulary Expansion in the ESOL Classroom" in TESOL Quarterly Vol.7, No.1, pages 61-78, 1978.